

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,754	07/23/2002	David L. Burke	Svejkovsky 22-3	2221
7.	590 05/04/200		EXAMINER	
Loren G. Helt		PADEN, CAROLYN A		
Browning Bushman 5718 Westheimer, Ste. 1800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Houston, TX	-		1761	
			DATE MAILED: 05/04/2000	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/042,754	BURKE ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Carolyn A. Paden	1761	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	th the correspondence address	S
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RI	EDI V IQ QET TO EYDIDE 2 M/	ONTH(S) OD THIDTY (30) D.	Δνς
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatio. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by s Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AB.	CATION. Papely be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this commur ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status .			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on (06 December 2005.		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for all	owance except for formal matte	ers, prosecution as to the mer	rits is
closed in accordance with the practice und	der <i>Ex par</i> te <i>Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>83-86,98-109 and 111-114</u> is/are	pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>83-86,98-109 and 111-114</u> is/are	rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	miner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b) objected to t	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	prrection is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.	121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by th	e Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-19	52.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
 Certified copies of the priority document 	nents have been received.		
Certified copies of the priority document	nents have been received in A	pplication No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the	•	received in this National Stag	je
application from the International Bu	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	a list of the certified copies not	received.	
Attachment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SI 		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152))
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	<u> </u>	•

Art Unit: 1761

The prior rejections of the claims, mailed October 6, 2005 have been withdrawn in response to applicants' arguments and amendments to the claims.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 83-86, 98-109, 111-114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Burke (6,588,363).

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or

Page 3

declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

Burke discloses a seasoning system and method. Drum 16 provides from a way to rotate and move the seasoned food through the coating system in a reciprocating motion. The claims appear to differ from the reference in the speed at which the tumble drum is turned. One of ordinary skill in the art would be expected to operate the drum in an optimal manner to move the food through without having to incline the tumble drum (see column 7, lines 24-39).

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In*

Art Unit: 1761

re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 83-86, 98-109, 111-114 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 59-65, especially claims 63-65 of U.S. Patent No. 6,588,363. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it is not seen that the speed of the forward movement relative to the backward movement alone constitutes unobviousness.

Burke discloses a seasoning system and method. Claims 63-65 provide for coating a tumbling product. The reciprocating aspect of the drum is disclosed in the abstract and at column 7, lines 24-39. Drum 16 provides from a way to rotate and move the seasoned food through the coating system in a reciprocating motion. The claims appear to differ from

Art Unit: 1761

the reference in the speed at which the tumble drum is turned. One of ordinary skill in the art would be expected to operate the drum in an optimal manner to move the food through without having to incline the tumble drum (see column 7, lines 24-39).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carolyn A Paden whose telephone number is (571) 272-1403. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano, can be reached on (571) 272-1398 or by dialing 571-272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on

Application/Control Number: 10/042,754

Art Unit: 1761

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CAPOLYN PADEN 5-2-

PRIMARY EXAMINER /76/

Page 6